

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the drawings by replacing the sheets that contain Figs. 1, 3 and 7 with the attached replacement drawing sheets.

REMARKS

Claims 2-14 are pending in the application. Claims 2-13 have been amended. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 14 is newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action has objected to the drawing for the reasons noted in paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action.

With respect to paragraph 2, the drawing is being amended, subject to the approval of the Examiner, by adding reference numeral 116 to Fig. 1 as depicted on the attached replacement sheet containing Fig. 1

Also with respect to paragraph 2, paragraph [0037] of the specification has been amended by changing “706” to “708” so that “706” is eliminated from the specification. Therefore, there is no need to amend Fig. 7 for this objection.

With respect to paragraph 3, paragraph [0036] of the specification has been amended to refer to reference numeral “602”. Therefore, there is no need to amend Fig. 6.

With respect to paragraph 4, the drawing is being amended, subject to the approval of the Examiner, by changing reference numeral “728” associated with the box labeled “SET INSTRUCTION TO PENDING” IN Fig. 7 TO “729” as depicted on the attached replacement sheet containing Fig. 7. A corresponding amendment has been made to paragraph [0037] of the specification.

Also, with respect to paragraph 4, the drawing is being amended, subject to the approval of the Examiner, by changing reference numeral “312” associated with the column labeled “current” in Fig. 3 to “314” as depicted in the replacement sheet

containing Fig. 3. A corresponding amendment has been made to paragraph [0033] of the specification.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the objection to the drawing is obviated by the amendments to the drawing and to the specification.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,881,115 to Lipner et al., hereafter Lipner.

This rejection is moot as to claim 1, which has been canceled.

With respect to claims 2-7 and 9-13, this rejection is obviated by the amendment for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to depend from new independent claim 14. Independent claim 14 recites presenting an interactive display screen to an operator that displays a plurality of outputs of a selected step of at least one sequential control module, wherein the outputs comprise a combination of at least one automatic expression and at least one interactive instruction. Lipner's system displays either a screen that has manual mode steps or a screen that has automatic mode steps. However, Lipner does not disclose or teach a display of a screen that contains a combination of at least one automatic expression and at least one interactive instruction of a plurality of outputs of a selected step of a sequential control module. Therefore, Lipner lacks the presenting step of independent claim 14 and its dependent claims 2 and 3.

Lipner also lacks the determining steps of independent claim 14, because Lipner's system is in either a manual mode or an automatic mode and does not need a determination of whether an output of a step is an automatic expression or an interactive instruction.

Independent claim 11 has also been amended to include substantially the same language as new independent claim 14. Thus, Lipner lacks elements or steps of amended independent claim 11 and its dependent claims 12 and 13 for the same reason set forth in the discussion of new independent claim 14.

Independent claim 4 and its dependent claims have been amended to recite a control system that uses sequential control modules. Independent claim 4 has been further amended to recite:

“a user interface component that provides at least a table view, said table view comprising a plurality of outputs of a selected step of at least one of said sequential control modules, wherein said outputs comprise a combination of at least one non-interactive instruction and at least one interactive instruction”.

Lipner does not disclose or teach a table view that comprises a combination of at least one non-interactive instruction and at least one interactive instruction. Lipner discloses a “manual mode” screen that has interactive instructions, but not a combination of at least one interactive instruction and at least one non-interactive instruction. Therefore, Lipner lacks the table view recited in independent claim 4 and its dependent claims 5-7, 9 and 10.

Lipner also lacks at least one controller that is operated by executing the interactive instruction at least partly in response to an operator input and the non-interactive instruction automatically as recited in amended independent claim 4. Lipner’s instructions in Figs. 2 and 3 are manual mode instructions that require operator input and not non-interactive instructions that are automatically executed by a controller.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lipner is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Lipner in view of U.S Patent No. 6,775,576 to Spriggs, hereafter Spriggs.

This rejection is obviated by the amendment to independent claim 4 from which claim 8 depends via intervening claim 6. That is, Lipner lacks elements recited in amended independent claim 4 as set forth in the discussion of claim 4. These elements are not disclosed or taught by Spriggs, which was cited for a different reason.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the objection to the drawing be withdrawn, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 2-14 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2/22/06



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500